

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Claim Amendments**

Claims 7-14 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 7, 9 and 12 are being amended. Claim 8 is being canceled and its elements incorporated into the amended claim 7 and amended claim 12. Claim 9 is being amended to depend from claim 7.

As these amendments are being submitted after a Final Rejection, the Applicant submits that all amendments are being made to bring the claims into allowable condition and do not change the scope of the examination already conducted by the Examiner.

### **II. Abstract**

The Examiner objected to the abstract of the disclosure for failure to conform to the MPEP format and language.

The Applicant herein amends the abstract to eliminate the language objected to by the Examiner. The Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

### **III. Specification**

The Examiner objected to the disclosure for failure to include the appropriate headings.

The Applicant herein amends the Specification to include the proper headings as specified in 37 CFR 1.77(b). The Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the disclosure be withdrawn

#### **IV. Claim Objections**

The Examiner objected to claim 9 as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of the previous claim.

The Applicant herein amends claim 9 to recite the elements of the claim in the context of the method. The Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 9 be withdrawn.

#### **V. Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112**

The Examiner rejected claims 8, 11 and 14 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

##### **a. Claim 8**

Specifically, the Examiner stated that the disclosure does not support the claim 8 element of “a number of group identifiers assigned to each of the basic services corresponding to a number of groups of basic services to which each of the basic services belongs.” The Applicant respectfully disagrees, and refers the Examiner to the third full paragraph on page 5 of the Specification and Figure 4. The basic service 34<sub>1</sub> is one embodiment of the element described in claim 8, as basic service 34<sub>1</sub> is a member of group 123 (identifier A) and group 45 (identifier B).

The specification S34<sub>1</sub> in Figure 4 shows how “a number of group identifiers” (identifiers A and B) are “assigned to each of the basic services” (basic service 34<sub>1</sub>) “corresponding to a number of groups of basic services” (identifiers A and B correspond to groups 123 and 45) “to which each of the basic services belongs” (basic service 34<sub>1</sub> belongs to groups 123 and 45). As described on page 5, lines 10-12 and shown in Figure 4, the identifiers A and B correspond to groups 123 and 45, respectively. These groups 123 and 45 are groups of basic services to which each of the basic services, such as basic service 34<sub>1</sub>, belongs. In Figure 4, the specification S34<sub>1</sub> of basic service 34<sub>1</sub> contains the group identifiers A and B to indicate how the number of group identifiers is assigned to each basic service 34<sub>1</sub>. Page 5, line 10 describes how group 123 is identified by identifier A, and line 12 describes how group 45 is identified by identifier B.

Therefore, the Applicant believes that claim 8 is properly supported by the original disclosure. Additionally, as claim 8 is being canceled and the elements incorporated into claim 7, the Applicant still maintains that the elements of the newly amended claim 7 are supported by the disclosure. The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

**b. Claims 11 and 14**

The Examiner stated that the disclosure does not support the elements of claims 11 and 14 of “maintaining at least one basic service of the group of basic services activated when the at least one of the basic services also belongs to another group of basic services, such that all the basic services that constitute the other group of basic services are activated.”

The Applicant respectfully disagrees, and refers the Examiner to Figure 4 and page 5, lines 15-25 of the Specification. In lines 15-20, the Specification describes how if logical connection 24 cannot be activated, the server SERV does not activate the other basic services in the group of basic services where logical connection 24 is found. In this case, this is group 123, which has logical connections 14, 24 and 34<sub>1</sub>.

The Specification then continues, in lines 21-25, to describe a second transaction, where although basic service 24 is still unavailable, basic service 34<sub>1</sub> is activated because basic service 34<sub>1</sub> is a member of another group of basic services, group 45, which can be activated.

Therefore, the Applicant believes that claims 11 and 14 are supported by the recited sections of the Specification and Figures. The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 11 and 14 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

## **VI. Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102**

The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 12 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,199,066 B1 to Glitho et al. (“Glitho”).

The Applicant herein amends claims 7 and 12 to incorporate the elements of claim 8, describing the step of “assigning a group identifier to each of the basic services of the group of basic services, a number of group identifiers assigned to each of the basic services corresponding to a number of groups of basic services to which each of the basic services belongs.” As noted by the Examiner in the Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103, Glitho fails to disclose the claimed

features of assigning a group identifier to each of the basic services of the group of basic services, a number of group identifiers assigned to each of the basic services corresponding to a number of groups of basic services to which each of the basic services belongs.

Claim 8 is being canceled. The Applicant discusses the allowability of the subject matter of claim 8 below with regard to the rejection under 35 USC §103.

Therefore, the Applicant believes that the rejection of Claims 7 and 12 under 35 USC §102(b) is now moot.

## **VII. Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103**

### **a. Claims 8-9**

The Examiner rejected claims 8-9 under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Glitho (US Pat No. 6,199,066 B1) in view of Laiho (US Pat No. 6,097,942).

The Applicant herein cancels claim 8 and incorporates the elements of this claim into claim 7 and 12. As such, the Applicant still discusses immediately below the allowability of the subject matter of claim 8 over the cited references, as they now apply to the allowability of claims 7 and 12.

The Applicant submits that the elements of claim 8 are not obvious over Glitho in view of Laiho, as both Glitho and Laiho, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach the elements of claim 8. Specifically, Laiho does not teach assigning group identifiers to *basic services* corresponding to a number of groups of basic services, as recited in claim 8. Laiho instead

describes assigning identifiers to groups of *subscribers*, not services. The Abstract of Laiho clearly states: “One or more *groups of mobile subscribers* are defined, and a *group identifier* is assigned to each *member* of the *group*.” *Laiho, Abstract*, lines 4-5 (emphasis added). The Examiner cites to the next section of the Abstract of Laiho which states: “One or more services are established for the *group of mobile subscribers* and are associated with the group identifier.” *Laiho, Abstract*, lines 6-7. However, Laiho fails to disclose where a group identifier is assigned to the *services* that are established for the group of mobile subscribers, as Laiho only discloses assigning an identifier to the group of mobile *subscribers*, not services.

The Examiner additionally cites to Laiho as disclosing where “The group identifier links each group member’s subscriber record stored in the first database section with the corresponding group services stored in the second database section.” However, Laiho only attempts to organize groups of *subscribers* so that services can be easily updated and delivered to all members of the groups of subscribers. There is no discussion Laiho of organizing the *services* by group identifier such that the identifier corresponds to a number of *groups of services* to which each of the services belongs, as recited in claim 8. Therefore, Glitho and Laiho fail to teach the invention of claim 8 sufficient for a rejection under 35 USC §103(a).

Further, Laiho provides no motivation to combine or modify its teaching to apply with the teachings of Glitho to obtain the invention of claim 8. The Examiner states that the combination of Laiho and Glitho “would have allowed Laiho’s method to more readily permit new services and subscribers to be added to a mobile communications system with minimal signaling overhead.” *Laiho*, col. 2, lines 9-11. However, the invention of claim 8 is concerned

only with providing services for using a telecommunications network, and not with adding or managing new subscribers, as discussed in Laiho. The invention of claim 8 assigns group identifiers to basic services in order to, in one embodiment, more efficiently activate services when one basic service is unavailable. There is no mention in Glitho or Laiho about assigning identifiers to subscribers so that services can be provided to subscribers if one subscriber is unavailable. Therefore, the Applicant submits that it is not obvious to modify the method of Glitho with the approach of Laiho to arrive at the invention of claim 8. The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 8, as applicable to the newly-amended claims 7 and 12, be withdrawn.

The Applicant further submits that claim 9 is allowable at least based on its dependency to claim 8 (now claim 7), and additionally requests that the rejection of claim 9 also be withdrawn.

**b. Claims 10, 11, 13 and 14**

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 11, 13 and 14 under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Glitho (US Pat No. 6,199,066 B1) in view of Dobbins (US Pat No. 5,825,772).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees, and submits that Dobbins, taken alone or in combination with Glitho, fails to teach the elements of claim 10 and 13. Specifically, Dobbins does not teach “rendering the basic services of the group inactive when at least one of the basic services of the group of basic services becomes unavailable.” In fact, Dobbins teaches the opposite situation, where when a switch has a connection path fail, the “connections not using that part of the path *remain intact*.” *Dobbins*, col. 5, lines 30-31. While the embodiment of

claims 10 and 13 act to render *all the basic services* of a group of services inactive when at least one of the basic services becomes inactive, Dobbins teaches that if a link or node fails, only the connections using the failed link path are torn down, while “connections not using that part of the path remain intact.” Therefore, Dobbins actually *teaches away from the invention* of claims 10 and 13, as Dobbins only teaches tearing down connections directly affected by a link failure, not a group of connections.

Furthermore, Dobbins fails to teach any organizational system as described in any of claims 10, 11, 13 or 14 that could be equated with a “group of basic services.” The Examiner states that Dobbins is directed to a method and apparatus for providing connection-oriented services for packet-switched data communications networks in which a distributed call rerouting service is provided. However, Dobbins does not describe any aspect in which the connection-oriented services or the network switches and nodes are organized into groups of services, as recited in claims 10, 11, 13 or 14. Additionally, Dobbins does not mention any action in the rerouting service that is applied to a group of services.

For at least the reasons stated above, the Applicant submits that neither Glitho nor Dobbins, taken alone or in combination, teach the elements of claims 10 and 13. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 10 and 13 under 35 USC §103(a) be withdrawn.

The Applicant also submits that claims 11 and 14 are allowable at least based on their dependency to claims 10 and 13, respectively, and additionally requests that the rejection of claims 11 and 14 also be withdrawn.



### **VIII. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott H. Davison/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (619) 238-3545  
Facsimile: (619) 238-4931

---

Scott H. Davison  
Registration No. 52,800

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 26, 2008